G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1891-2. P 58

~~191~~ .

(Municipal.)

File No. 21 of 91-2.

Serial Nos. 1 —— 21.

Papers Filed.

Month August 1896.

SUBJECT.

Remuneration to be paid to octroi and Mohatarfa Collectors.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES.

Indexed
L. Sreenivasa Rao

11085

(General No. 30.) L1285

1891.92

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt.
of Mysore.

Dated 9th February 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.
No. 818.

Govt. Pro: No: 12192-200 of
1st instant. L. 1201

States that Octroi is levied in only one municipality viz in the Town of Tumkur and that it is collected by the Municipal Overseer &c &c.

Mun'l Deptt Mch 11/2

To the Same No 5954-63 / L.F. 157-92 dt 31/10/92

Tumkur District

518 Deputy Commissioner's Office

Tumkur 9th February 1892.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No: 12192—200 / L 1201 of the 1st instant, I have the honor to state that Octroi (on Piece goods and on Sheep, goats and oxen slaughtered) is levied in this District in only one Municipality viz: in the Town of Tumkur. It is collected by the Municipal Overseer, while the Mohatarfa (consisting of hous Shop, loom, oil-mill and Cart t is collected at Tumkur and oth Municipalities by the Village Officer (viz: Shanbognes and Potels)—.

2. The Shanbognes and Po te not get any separate rem for this, but it is believed t Potey is calculated on the revenue as directed in Gove

Superintendent of Revenue Survey who settles the Potgy has been asked to say if this is the case —

3. I think that the present arrangement may continue.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt. Servant

[illegible]

Deputy Commissioner

Mun'l (General Serial No. 30). 12065

21 9 912 1891. L 1447

2 From The Dy Commissioner Hazaribagh

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Bengal

Dated 1st
Despatched 5th
Received

March 1892

Enclosures No. none

General No. 821
No. secy

Submitting report on the existing system of Collecting octroi & other taxes in the several Municipalities of the District &c —

To Mun'l Deptt
Have all replies come in
M. M.
7/3

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Hassan District.
Dated Camp Chenrayapatna 1st March

No. 821/Secy.

From, The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

To, The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No. 12192-200/L 1201 dated 1st Ultimo, I have the honor to submit a report on the existing System of Collecting Octroi and other taxes in the several Municipalities of this Distt and the Establishment employed on this work.

1. In the Hassan Town Octori duty is Collected by the Municipal Overseer assisted by Municipal Commissioners and by an establishment Consisting of 6 peons on Rs 5 each per mensum. This work is done under the immediate orders of the Vice President. Two Cuttays have already been established one at the eastern

entrance

entrance and the other at the western entrance of the town, where the duty is collected by 4 peons, two at each - and the remaining two are employed on detective duty.

2. House and Drobatarfa taxes are collected by a Drutsaddy on Rs 12 per mensem paid from the Municipal Funds. This establishment works under the immediate orders of the Amildar of Hassan Taluk. A Municipal peon and a Kulwady are deputed to assist the Drutsaddy during the Collection Season. Kasba Patel's Services are also utilized for this work when necessary. The Drutsaddy attends to other work in Connection with the Municipality under orders of the Vice President.

3. In the Minor Municipalities, House and Drobatarfa taxes are collected by respective Chauboffs under orders of Amildars without remuneration of any kind given them from the Municipality for their Services.

4. In the Hassan Town Municipality Jamabandy is conducted by the Hassan Amildar, and in the minor Municipalities this work is done by the respective Amildars, subject however to the Confirmation of the Deputy Commissioner, who is the President of the Municipal Board of the District.

5. In the Municipalities noted in

1. Aloor.
2. Sulkeshpur.
3. Belur.
4. Channarayapatna

the margin, octroi duty is collected by respective Chauboques, who are paid an allowance at 5 per cent on the aggregate collection thereof. This charge amounts to Rs 110 per annum as per accounts for 904. The maximum remuneration of a Chaubogue is Rs 40 and the minimum Rs 6 per annum. In the Belur Town this work is entrusted to the Municipal Duffedar who receives Commission at the rate specified above.

6. It may not be out of place to mention here, the inconveniences experienced

experienced by Amildars in getting responsible officials to entrust them with all work connected with the Municipal Department, as the Gunnastas working in the Revenue Department have been already over-burdened with work. The matter has been brought to the notice of Government in this Office No. 358 of 31st August 1891. Besides the collection work there is good deal to be done in the Taluk Cutcherry, viz, preparation of estimates for Municipal works and the accounts, Budgets &c.

7. Under these circumstances I am of opinion that without incurring extra charges at a reasonable cost in proportion to the income of the Municipality concerned, there is little probability of ensuring efficient and satisfactory discharge of work in the Department.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]

Offg Dy Commissioner

Mr.

(General Serial No. 30)

Mint

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE

189 12216 29 MAR. 92 L1479

From 21 19

Dy Commissioner

Chitaldroog Dt

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 6th March

Despatched 8

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 581

No. 550.

Submitting report regarding the Establishment maintained for collecting Octroi duty in the Municipalities of the Chitaldroog Dist

To the Commissioner

L & Deptt Msh 9/3/92

No: 581/550. En wil.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldroog District
Camp Bharamasagar
Dy 6th March 1892.
Depd 8th do

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No: 12192-200./L. 1201. dated the 1st February last calling for a report as to the establishment employed in the collection of octroi and other items of municipal revenue in the several municipalities of this District, I have the honor to state, that in the 4 municipalities noted in the margin× all municipal collections are made by the village officers.

× Chellakere.
Holalkere.
Jagaloor.
Molkalmuru.

2- In the municipalities of

Hiriyur

Hiriyur and Hosadurga, except Octroi which is collected by the Taluk Es=
=tablishment, the other items of Municipal revenue are collected by the Village officers.

3- In the Municipalities of Chitaldroog, Davengere and Harihar the Municipal Mootsaddies, who are to look after the work of Conservancy, also collect the Octroi duty, while all other items of revenue are collect=
=ed by the Village officers.

4 - Thus it will be seen that No separate Establishment is Main=
tained in any of the Municipalities in this District for the Collection of Municipal revenues.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

[signature]
Deputy Commissioner.

Mont

21/7/91

(General Serial No. 30.) 2400

1892. L 345

4 From

The Deputy Commr
Kadur District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govt
of Mysore

Dated 25th May 1892

Despatched 27th

Received

Enclosures No

General No. 35
No

With reference to the Government Proceedings No 12192-200 L 1201 dated 1st February 1892 regarding the establishment employed in the collections of Octroi in the several municipalities of this District, has the honor to submit herewith a detailed memo shew the existing arrangement in each municipality for the collection revenues.

[signature]
Deputy Commr
Kadur Dist

L Bds Branch
Msk 30/5/92

A
30-5-92

Encl 6-81-4

Memo.

Regarding the octroi and other collections in the Municipalities of the Kadur District in accordance with the Government Proceedings No. 12192-200 L 1201 dated 1st February,

Tarikere

The octroi collection on oil are made by the municipal overseer at Tarikere is both overseer Mutsuddi and is as by a municip[al] peon on Rs 6/- mensem. But only on cloths levied by the Re Gumasta who addition to he is deputed to this work an stamp the cl He gets no com Oil and piece

are the only two articles
on which Octroi is
levied in this Town
The Mohatarpha and
house tax are collected
by the Shoubhog who
is paid an allowance
of Rs 24/- annually
for this work Being
pretty large town
the work is heavy
and the allowance
to the Shoubhog is
necessary.

Octroi is levied. Agjampur
any articles at
Agjampoor The
Mohatarpha and
house tax are collected
the Shoubhog, he
no allowance
here is a municipal
on on Rs 6/- per
visum. —

only article on
Octroi is levied Kadur & Beiur

in these

At Kadur the octro-
is levied under the
Supervision of the Taluk
Sheristedar and the
Sayer monegar is paid
an allowance of Rs 5/-
per cent on the municipal
collection There is a
municipal peon o-
Rs 4/- in Kadur, and
at Birur the octro
is collected by the
Sayer monegar wh-
a commission
per cent There
a municipal K
or peon on Rs
mensem. The c-
on account of
-tarpha and
-tax in bo
-cipalities
by the Pot-
-bhoges
allowa

ted to Rs 25-10-5
Kadur and Rs 24-10-5
at Birur. The commission
may be stopped hereafter.

The Mohatarpha and
house-tax are collected
by the Patel and Shanbhog.
They get no allowance.
There is a municipal
mutsuddi on Rs 6/-
who in addition to
other work, collects
octroi on piecegoods
or the supervision
the Deputy Amildar
no other articles
ri is levied.

Yedehalli

Mohatarpha
house-tax are
by a separate
l Mutsuddi
ng on Rs 10/-
apisted

Chikmaglur.

Establishment is necessary. The town is made up of two villages viz Chikmagalur & Basavanahalli and it would not be convenient to assign the work to the Village Shanbhogs who have to collect the Kandaya on Government lands and do Pahani and other work. Moreover the whole of the Mohatar collections of this town is credited to the municipality. In the other towns only half of it is credited.

A list shewing the Establishment maintained by the Municipality for octroi collection is appended. The Establishment is necessary because in this town octroi is levied the following articles cocoanuts, fresh & dry

Oil, Tobacco, Cigar
Cloth.

The octroi and other Srinagar
collections of this
Municipality are
made by the octroi
Manager assisted by a
peon, salary ~~Rs~~
10 and 6 respectively.

~~Rs~~ 3/- is paid
to the Deputy Munshi
of the Amildars office
from the Municipality
for keeping the Municipal
correspondence &c.

The Srinagar
Amildar reports that
this separate establishment
is necessary as there
are only two Shambhogs
for all the villages
of the Jaghir -

H M Sparkes
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur Distt.

Chikmaglur
25th May 1892.

the establishments

in collec octroi in

(General Serial No. 30)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
2499
1892 - JUN. 92
L354

Mun!

21 From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

5

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore

Dated 27th May 1892
Despatched 31st Do.
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 880
No 192

Reporting as to the establishment employed in the collection of Octroi duty

To the Same 554-63 31/10/92

LBds Branch
Mrk 1/6/92

M
2-6-92

Memo General Serial No. 3091

21491-2 1892. L 416

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 13 JUN. 92

From

6 The Deputy Commissioner Shimoga district

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated

Despatched 11th June

Received

Enclosures No. one

General No. 270
No.

Submits report in connection with the Establishment employed in the collection of Actroi and Mohatarfa in the several municipalities of the Shimoga district —

To the Same No. 5954-3 8/1/92

L H Branch
Mohr 13/6/92

A
14-6-92

No 270/259 Sm.1

Shimoga District
Deputy Commr's Office
Shimoga 11th June 1892.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No 12192-200/L 1201 dated the 1st February last, I have the honor to forward a Statement showing the particulars of Octroi and Mohatarfa collected in each of the Municipalities in this District together with the cost of the establishments maintained by them.

Shimoga. 2. In this Municipality the Octroi is levied not only on piece goods but also on 8 other articles, the duty amounts to Rs 5650 while the cost of levying it is Rs 588 i.e more than 10 per cent.

3. The Sayer Manegar with the aid of his Karkun collects

Octroi. Neither of these officials is paid anything by the Municipality for this duty. The whole of Rs 588 paid by the Municipality goes to the 11 Kolkars 10 of whom are posted at the five Ukuds, 2 at each and the remaining one Kolkar is working at the Sayer-Katte where the Manegar with his Karkoon is employed.

4. The Mohatarfa amounts to Rs 7002 which is collected by a Karkoon aided by peons, costing the Municipality Rs 264 a year i.e about 4 p.c.

5. The supervision of the Conservancy inclusive of a Gumasta on Rs 12 working at the Taluk Cutcherry costs Rs 876 a year while not quite Rs 200 o/o is spent on actual work road repairs &c.

6. The establishments maintained are much too costly and have to be curtailed to the lowest possible minimum, if it is intended to

spend more money year by year on useful works, which is very necessary

7. The Vice President (Mr Nagesha Rao) thinks that it is not possible to arrange the collection of the Octroi and Mohatarfa by the village officials and that the establishments now maintained should continue.

8. Shimoga has a Patel who is paid a Potgi of Rs 25-4-0 a year and a Shanbhogue who has three adjoining villages besides the town and he is paid Rs 77-12-0.

These officials do no part of the Municipal work.

9. I think the services of the Patel and Shanbhogue should be availed of and the establishment reduced at least as follows:-

1 Taluk Mutsaddi at Rs 12	144
1 Karkoon at Rs 12	144
2 Peons at Rs 5	120
1 Octroi Kolkar @ Rs 5	60
	Rs 468

per Annum.

This will still have a heavy cost of Rs 1260 a year.

10. The Municipal Overseer on Rs 25+5 a month, ought to be able to manage the whole work under the general heads with the help of the Patel, the Shanbhogue and the Daffedar, a man who can read and write Canarese being put into the last named post.

11. The village officials collect Mohatarfa in all the other Municipalities except Tirthalli where the Sayer Manegar collects it as well as the Octroi on piece goods. The village officials may collect Mohatarfa in future at Tirthalli as in other Towns.

Other Municipalities.

12. At Sagar and Sorab, the Sayer Kolkar and Karkoon respectively collect the Octroi on piece goods.

13. The Octroi is collected by

Municipal Mutsaddis in the Municipalities noted on the margin. In all these places there are Sayer Kattes except Ayanty which has none.

14. The Sayer officials may well collect the Octroi at the said places as at the other towns, and the village officials may collect Octroi also at Ayanty.

15. No Octroi exists at Benkipur, Holehonnur and Kumsi.

16. The Amildars of Sagar and Shikarpur expressed no opinion in respect of the proposal under discussion while the others, are in favor of the existing arrangements.

17. The Municipal Mutsaddis now employed may be kept on for conservancy supervision &c except those at Ayanty and Sirpalkop where their services

may well be dispensed with.

18. The Municipalities of Holehonnur, Nagar and Sorab pay Rs 12 a year to the Taluk Gumastahs for Municipal work done by them while the Sagar Municipality pays Rs 24. This payment in the case of the Holehonnur Municipality may be done away with and the payment at Sagar reduced to Rs 12 a year.

19. The Sub Division officer at Sagar recommends the collection of Octroi and Mohalarfa by the village officials and a commission of 2 per cent being paid to them but I think this is not necessary any where except at Shimoga where a commission of one per cent may be paid to the Patel and Shanbhogue who may well

collect

collect the Town Mohatarfa - This will give them Rs 35 each a year (more or less) -

The existing arrangements of the collection of Octroi by the Sayer officials as detailed above may continue -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

Abd Rub Khan Bahadur.
Deputy Commissioner

K.S.





(General Serial No 30)

Mar 1892. 2609.

From 2.405

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Dated 1st September 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. one

General No.
No. 508

Submitting report on the establishment maintained for the collection of octroi and other taxes in the municipalities of this District.

B. Br. Mon 5/9.

To the Janice No 5964 - 63 23/10/92

20:508.
M. 1.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Mysore District.
Dated Mysore 1st September
1892.

From

A. Rungasamy Iyengar Esq.
B. A. B. L.
Deputy Commissioner.

To,

The Chief Secretary.
to the Government of Mysore.
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your reminder No. 2995/L 251 dated 24th August 1892, calling attention to Government Proceedings No. 12192-200/L 1201 dated 1st February 1892, calling for a report as to the establishment employed for the collection of Octroi and other taxes in the several Municipalities in the Mysore District, I have the honor to submit herewith a statement containing full in-

formation.

X
File
Reminder
Lec I

On the subject.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
A Ramasamy
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Counted
Wu



Mount
Read again Q 1st Proceedings
dated 1st February 1892 cl 12192 200 / L1201

Read the following papers regarding the agency employed for the collection of Octroi, and other municipal taxes &c

(1) Letter from the D Comr of Tumkur dated 9 February 1892 cl 818
(2) — do — Hassan D 1/3/92 cl 821
(3) — do — Chittaldroog D 6/3/92 cl 581/550
(4) Docket — do — Kadur D 25/5/92 cl 35
(5) Letter — do — Kolar D 27/5/92 cl 880/192
(6) — do — do — Shimoga D 11/6/92 cl 270/259
(7) — do — Mysore D 1/9/92 cl 518

Order thereon

In the Proceedings dated 1st February 1892 cl 12192-200 / L1201 Government observed that the Octroi and other collection in some municipalities were made without payment of any commission to village officers or entertaining any special establishments for the

Recd by this
& let me
see
[illegible]
20/10/92

R
L 643

5954-63
L.J. 157-92 Q 31/10/92

From Bangalore D.C.
875 Q 3.3.93 L 1788

[illegible] in this file still printed copies are received from Press office
[illegible]
29/10/92

same, while in some Municipalities, there were either special establishments maintained or commission paid to village officers, ~~and they deserving to have a full report on the subject~~ ~~Govt.~~ therefore called upon the Presidents of all Municipalities except the largest towns of Bangalore and Mysore, where separate establishments are absolutely necessary to explain the existing arrangements in each Municipality for the collection of revenue and to furnish their opinion ~~why the~~ as to the feasibility or otherwise ~~revenues should not every~~ of a uniform system of collection ~~where be collected~~ by ~~means of~~ village officers and the taluk establishments without any extra cost to the Municipalities.

The papers recorded above are in reply:-

The D/ Com^r of the Kolar District reports that the Octroi on cloth is collected by the Amildar or Shevestadar in the Taluks and by the D/ Amildar or

Octroi

+ c to $\frac{880}{192}$ D/ 27 May 1892

Head Gumasta in the Sub-Taluks, the Pineegoods being taken by the owners to the Taluk catcheries

Mohatarfa and miscellaneous are collected by village Shanbhog and Patels, to whom 1 per cent commission is paid in minor Municipalities, while in the District head quarter town salaries at ~~12 A.~~ the rates of 7 A. & 5 A. per mensem are paid respectively to the Patel and Shanbhog

The D) Com. suggests the continuance of the present arrangement till the introduction of Pucka Polegee settlement, in which Mohatarfa collections will, he believes, ~~may~~ be taken into account

Headds that if the village officials are relieved of the work, a separate establishment will have to be entertained at a very high cost

Tumkur D) (Com's ch 818 D) 9th February 1892

In Tumkur, Octroi is collected by the Municipal Overseer, while Mohatarfa in this and other Municipalities is levied by village officials without any 'in' ection, as

is believed that Mohatarfa tax was taken into account in fixing the Pucha Potigee. The Dy Coms recommends the continuance of the present arrangement

Octroi is collected in the municipalities of Sivingapatam, Hunsur and Nanjungud, but separate establishments are maintained in the first and the last towns only, while for Hunsur, where no establishment at present exists, the Board recommend the payment of a commission to the collection ~~Establish~~ agency

Mysore Dy Coms letter dated 1st September 1892 No 508

Sivingapatam enjoys full Mohatarfa and the other municipalities a moiety thereof, but Sivingapatam and Melkote alone ~~The formed first named municipality~~, maintains in special establishments while ~~and~~ commission is paid to the village servants ~~for~~ in Nanjungud. as no Pucha Potigee is received by them. The Dy Com considers that the collection establishment in Sivingapatam has to be strengthened, and that instead of a separate Mulsuddy for Melkote, the payment of commission to the village servants would prove financially advantageous to the municipality

The Municipal Board at Hunsur consider that as only a moiety of Mohatarfa is credited to them, no cost on account of its collection should be debited to them

Special establishments are maintained at Hassan for collecting Octroi, while in other towns village servants ~~collect~~ do the work on payment of 5 per cent commission ~~is paid~~ except at Belur, where the work is entrusted to the Municipal Duffadar who receives commission at the same rate

Letter from the Dy Com of Hassan dated 1st March 1892 No 821

The District Head Quarter town employs a mutseddy for collecting the Mohaturfa tax, while the same collected by village servants in minor municipalities without any remuneration whatever.

Shimoga Dy Comrs letter Dy 11/6/92 etc 270/259.

In Shimoga separate establishments are maintained for the collection of Octroi as well as Mohaturfa. In minor municipalities, Mohaturfa is collected by village officials, except at Thurthahalli, where the work is entrusted to the Sayer Manegar; while Octroi is collected in Chennagiri, Honnali Nyamati, Shikarpur, Siralcope and Sagar by municipal mutseddies and in Nagar Thurthahally and Sorab by Sayer establishment.

The Sub-Division off

Sagar is of opinion that the collection of Octroi and Mohatur, may be entrusted to the village officials on payment of 2 per cent commission, but the Dy Comr considers that this is not necessary except at Shimoga, where the costly establishments employed for the collection of Mohaturfa may be replaced by village officials, ~~that~~ & the existing Octroi establishment reduced considerably; and that the collection of Octroi in the other towns may be entrusted to sayer establishments.

In Chickmaglur and Srungeri, separate establishments are employed for collecting Octroi and Mohaturfa including House tax and their continuance is stated

Kadur Dy Comr's Docket dated 25 May 1892 No 35.

stated to be necessary. In the other municipalities except Ajjampur, where there is a Peon on 6 Rs per mensem, House and Mohateerfa taxes are co[illegible] by village officials, on payment of commission ~~being paid~~. The continuance of this system is recommended. The procedure observed as regards Octroi varies in different places. In Tarekere, duty on one of the 2 articles, viz Oil, is collected by the Municipal Mutsuddy, but that on the other, viz Cloth by the Taluk Gumasta. In Kadur, and Beerur, Sayer establish-ments collect Octroi receiving 5 per cent commission with the assistance of Peons employed at the cost of municipal funds.

In Yedahally however, the Munic. Mutsuddy, in addition to his legitimate duties, collects the tax under the supervision of the Deputy Amildar. The Dy Coms recommends the discontinuance of the commission paid for the collection of Octroi in Kadur and Beeur.

The Dy Coms of the Chittaldroog District states in his letter dated 6 March 1892 No $\frac{581}{550}$ that no separate establishments are maintained in any of the municipalities for the collection of municipal revenues. In Chellakere, Holalkere, Jagaloor and Molkalmoor all municipal collections are made by the village officers In Hunyur and

and Hosdroog, Octroi is collected by Taluk establishments and in Chittaldroog, Davengere and Harihar by Mutsuddies employed for conservancy.

Inbd. J.P.

The Govt are of opinion that Motuskha showed always & every where be collected by the Taluq & village establishments as it is part of their legitimate duty, & they direct that this be done in future except in the ~~Cantons~~ cities of Bangalore & Mysore. Where the Pakka Potigi has been fixed & the Motuskha collections are taken into account in fixing the Potigi, the village offrs are not entitled to any special remuneration, but where it has not yet been fixed, or if fixed.

1 — a fact which may be ascertained from the settlement Dept.

where the Motorpha
has ~~to~~ not ~~not~~ been
taken into account,
the Dy Comrs may,
at their discretion, grant
the village establishments
a small commn, not
exceeding 2 per
cent on the collections. — No special
establishments should
be entertained for the
collection of motorpha —

~~As regards octroi,~~
The moiety payable to
Govt ~~must be with reference~~ is the moiety of
~~to~~ the ~~net~~ net collections, ~~[illegible]~~ that is, ~~[illegible]~~ collections minus the
commission paid to
village offrs, ~~[illegible]~~ of any.

As regards octroi,
which is entirely a
municipal tax, it
must be collected by
the municipal authorities
at the expense of the
municipal funds but
where it could be easily
collected by the
Talug, sayar, or village
establishments, ~~subject~~
~~to the~~ it may be done
so & a small commn, not exceeding 5 per cent
paid to them where
such payment is

considered necessary. The

The Dr Commrs are requested to give ~~carry~~ ~~out the~~ effect to the above orders from 1st January 1893, ~~the~~ ~~submit a detailed report of the arrangements made.~~

Moiety paid to Govt on some articles showed. ~~[illegible] the moiety [illegible] of the gross collections, minus 5 per cent [illegible] of gross collections, if they the collections are made by the municipal authorities & moiety of the gross collections of made by other Govt offrs.~~

as in the case of Mutuppa be half of the net collections.

Where the collections are made by municipal authorities, ~~[illegible]~~ who have also other duties to perform, 5 per cent may be deducted as the cost of collections.

16/10/92

Print

17/10/92

For Chief Secretary

To

The Presidents of the mtees in all the Districts except Bangalore and Mysore Cities

Comptroller

Superintendent Rev Survey & Settlement

Mem Copies to the Presidents of the Bangalore & Mysore Cities

R

L644

5964-5

L.F. 157-92

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Local Boards Branch—Municipal),—dated 31st October 1892.

READ AGAIN :—

Government Proceedings, dated 1st February 1892, No. 12192-200—L. 1201

READ :—

The following papers regarding the agency employed for the collection of Octroi, and other Municipal taxes, &c.

(1) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur, dated 9th February 1892, No. 818.

(2) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan, dated 1st March 1892, No 821.

(3) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldroog, dated 6th March 1892, No. 581—550.

(4) Docket from the Deputy Commissioner of Kadur, dated 25th May 1892, No 35.

(5) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar, dated 27th May 1892, No 880—192

(6) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Shimoga, dated 11th June 1892, No. 270—259.

(7) Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore, dated 1st September 1892, No 508.

No 5954-63—L. F. 157-92, DATED BANGALORE, 31ST OCTOBER 1892.

ORDER THEREON.—In their Proceedings, dated 1st February 1892, No. 12192-200—L. 1201, Government observed that the Octroi and other collection in some Municipalities were made without payment of any commission to village officers or entertaining any special establishments for the same, while in some Municipalities there were either special establishments maintained or commission paid to village officers and therefore called upon the Presidents of all Municipalities, except the largest towns of Bangalore and Mysore, where separate establishments are absolutely necessary, to explain the existing arrangements in each Municipality for the collection of revenue and to furnish their opinion as to the feasibility or otherwise of a uniform system of collection by village officers and the Taluk establishments without any extra cost to the Municipalities. The papers recorded above are in reply.

No. 880—192, dated 27th May 1892.

2. The Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District reports* that the Octroi on cloth is collected by the Amildar or Sheristadar in the Taluks and by the Deputy Amildar or Head Gumasta in the Sub-Taluks, the piece goods being taken by their owners to the Taluk Cutcherries.

3. Mohatarfa and Miscellaneous items are collected by village Shanbhogs and Patels, to whom 1 per cent commission is paid in Minor Municipalities, while in the District Head-quarter town, salaries at the rates of Rs. 7 and Rs. 5 per mensem are paid to the Patel and Shanbhog respectively.

4. The Deputy Commissioner suggests the continuance of the present arrangement till the introduction of Pakka Potige settlement, in which Mohatarfa collections will, he believes, be taken into account. He adds that if the village officials are relieved of the work, a separate establishment will have to be entertained at a very high cost.

Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's No. 818, dated 9th February 1892.

5. In Tumkur, Octroi is collected by the Municipal Overseer, while Mohatarfa in this and other Municipalities is levied by village officials without any remuneration, as it is believed that Mohatarfa tax was taken into account in fixing the Pakka Potige. The Deputy Commissioner recommends the continuance of the present arrangement.

6. Octroi is collected in the Municipalities of Seringapatam, Hunsur and Nanjangud, but separate establishments are maintained in the first and the last towns only, while for Hunsur, where no establishment at present exists, the Board recommend the payment of a commission to the collection agency.

Mysore Deputy Commissioner's letter, dated 1st September 1892, No. 508.

7. Seringapatam enjoys full Mohatarfa and the other Municipalities a moiety thereof, but Seringapatam and Melkote alone maintain special establishments, while commission is paid to the village servants, in Nanjangud, as no Pakka Potige is received by them. The Deputy Commissioner considers that the collection establishment in Seringapatam has to be strengthened and that instead of a separate Mutsaddi for Melkote, the payment of commission to the village servants would prove financially advantageous to the Municipality. The Municipal Board at Hunsur consider that, as only a moiety of Mohatarfa is credited to them, no cost on account of its collection should be debited to them.

8. Special establishments are maintained at Hassan for collecting Octroi, while in other towns village servants do the work on payment of 5 per cent commission except at Belur, where the work is entrusted to the Municipal Dafadar who receives commission at the same rate.

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan, dated 1st March 1892, No. 821.

9. The District Head-quarter town employs a Mutsaddi for collecting the Mohatarfa tax, while the same is collected by village servants in Minor Municipalities without any remuneration whatever.

10. In Shimoga separate establishments are maintained for the collection of Octroi as well as Mohatarfa. In Minor Municipalities Mohatarfa is collected by village officials, except at Tirthahalli, where the work is entrusted to the Sayer Manegar; while Octroi is collected in Channagiri, Honnali, Nyamti, Shikarpur, Siralkoppa and Sagar by Municipal Mutsaddis and in Nagar, Tirthahalli and Sorab by Sayer establishments.

Shimoga Deputy Commissioner's letter, dated 11th June 1892, No. 270—259.

11. The Sub-Division Officer of Sagar is of opinion that the collection of Octroi and Mohatarfa may be entrusted to the village officials on payment of 2 per cent commission, but the Deputy Commissioner considers that this is not necessary except at Shimoga, where the costly establishments employed for the collection of Mohatarfa may be replaced by village officials, and the existing Octroi establishment reduced considerably; and that the collection of Octroi in the other towns may be entrusted to Sayer establishments.

12. In Chikmagalur and Sringeri, separate establishments are employed for collecting Octroi and Mohatarfa including House tax and their continuance is stated to be necessary. In the other Municipalities except Ajjampur, where there is a Peon on Rs. 6 per mensem, House and Mohatarfa taxes are collected by village officials, on payment of commission. The continuance of this system is recommended. The procedure observed as regards Octroi varies in different places. In Tarikere, duty on one of the 2 articles, *viz.*, oil, is collected by the Municipal Mutsaddi, but that on the other, *viz.*, cloth by the Taluk Gumasta. In Kadur and Birur, Sayer establishments collect Octroi receiving 5 per cent commission with the assistance of Peons employed at the cost of Municipal Funds. In Yedahalli, however, the Municipal Mutsaddi, in addition to his legitimate duties collects the tax under the supervision of the Deputy Amildar. The Deputy Commissioner recommends the discontinuance of the commission paid for the collection of Octroi in Kadur and Birur.

Kadur Deputy Commissioner's docket, dated 25th May 1892, No. 35.

13. The Deputy Commissioner of the Chitaldroog District states in his letter, dated 6th March 1892, No. 581—550, that no separate establishments are maintained in any of the Municipalities for the collection of Municipal revenues. In

Challakere, Holalkere, Jagalur and Molkalmuru, all Municipal collections are made by the village officers. In Hiriyur and Hosdurga, Octroi is collected by Taluk establishments and in Chitaldroog, Davangere and Harihar, by Mutsaddis employed for conservancy.

14. The Government are of opinion that Mohatarfa should always and everywhere be collected by the taluk and village establishments, as it is part of their legitimate duty and they direct that this be done in future except in the Cities of Bangalore and Mysore. Where the Pakka Potige has been fixed and the Mohatarfa collections are taken into account in fixing the Potige—a fact which may be ascertained from the Settlement Department—the village officers are not entitled to any special remuneration, but where it has not yet been fixed, or if fixed the Mohatarfa has not been taken into account, the Deputy Commissioners may, at their discretion, grant the village establishments a small commission, not exceeding 2 per cent on the collections. No special establishments should be entertained for the collection of Mohatarfa. The moiety payable to Government is the moiety of the net collections, that is, collections minus the commission paid to village officers, if any.

15. As regards Octroi, which is entirely a Municipal tax, it must be collected by the Municipal authorities at the expense of the Municipal Funds, but where it could be easily collected by the Taluk, Sayer, or village establishments, it may be done so and a small commission, not exceeding 5 per cent paid to them when such payment is considered necessary. The moiety paid to Government on some articles should, as in the case of Mohatarfa, be half of the net collections. Where the collections are made by Municipal authorities, who have also other duties to perform, 5 per cent may be deducted as the cost of collections.

16. The Deputy Commissioners are requested to give effect to the above orders from 1st January 1893.

T. ANANDA ROW,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Presidents of the Municipalities in all the Districts except, Bangalore and Mysore Cities.
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Settlements.

Memo No. 5964-5—L. F. 157-92.

Copies to the Presidents of the Bangalore and Mysore City Municipalities.

1892.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

LOCAL BOARDS BRANCH—MUNICIPAL.

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 31st *October* 1892.

No. 5954-6:
L.F. 157-9:

Passing orders as regards the agency to be employed for the collection of Octroi and Mohatarfa in Municipal Towns and the remuneration to be paid to them.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—16-11-92.—12

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 9774

From The Dy Commissioner Hassan District

L 1754

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 1st March 1893

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 852

No. Secy.

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Stating that the present arrangement of a Mutsuddy being employed for collecting Mohatarfa taxes is more economical than to entrust the work to the village servants on payment of Commissioner

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Sir

Orders are solicited as to whether the proposed Clerk may be sanctioned

[illegible] 6/3/93

To the Dewan Sec 15-920 24/3/93 L 7-15-7-92

The Dy Cr's further report is requested with regr to the following observations —

The Dy Cr's report does not state whether or not the Mohtarfa collections of Hassan town have been reckoned as revenue on which the Shanbogue & Patel's Potji has been based. This fact should be carefully ascertained & reported —

Who now writes up the Khanesumari accounts which form the basis of the Mohtarfa Jamabandy —

The 5% alluded to in para 15 of the printed Pro of 31 Oct last apparently include all charges on acct of collection; whereas the Dy Cr has compared agt it only the pay of the mut-saddy omitting the salaries of peons &c employed on Octroi work.

[illegible]

No 852
Secy

Deputy Commissioners office
Hassan district
Dated. Hassan. March 1893

From.
The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan district.

To The Chief Secretary
to Government of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No 5954-63 / LF 157-92 dated 31st October last, directing that village servants should be entrusted with the collection of Octroi and Mohatarfa taxes in municipal towns, I have the honor to state that in the Hassan Town a Mutsuddy is appointed on a salary of Rs 12 per mensem or at a cost of 144 Rs per annum. If this

work is entrusted to the village servants a Commission of Rs 194 will have to be paid as shown below.—

Commission on 3200 Rs of Mohatarfa at Rs 2 per cent —	Rs 64 — " — "
do on Rs 2600 Octroi Collections at Rs 5 per cent.	130 — " — "
	194 — " — "

2. The present arrangement is as may be observed more economical — Rs 50 additional expense being saved. Besides this Collection work, the Mutsuddy now employed helps in other office work of the vice President such as the keeping of accounts &c. I therefore beg that you will be good enough to obtain sanction

of Government to continue the present arrangement.—

I have the honor to be

Sir

your most obedient servant.

[signature]

For Dy Commissioner

[signature]

(General Serial No. 30.)

Muni

1892-93 L.F. 788

From The Dy Commissioner

(1) Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 3rd } March 1893.

Despatched 4th }

Received 6/3

Enclosures No. 2

General No.

D No. 875.

In reply to Govt. Pro. No. 5954-63 dy 31-10-92 (Para 14) L.F. 157-92

SUBJECT.

Soliciting orders regarding remuneration to be paid to village officials for collection of Mohatarfa in certain Minor Municipals

L.B. Mn 6/3

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the Same Inv 19177-8 17/1/93. L.F. 57-92

To the Same Sc 15785-68

Dy Commissioner's Office.
Bangalore District.

D. No. 875.
Enclosures.

Dated 3rd March 1893.

To
The Chief-Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Sir, In reference to paragraph 14 of the Proceedings of Government No. 5954-63 dated 31st October 1892, L.F. 157-92 in re agency to be employed for the collection of Mohatarfa in Municipal Towns and the remuneration to be paid to them, I have the honor to enclose a Statement showing the Mohatarfa collections Government and Municipal at the following places. 1 Yellahanka, 2 Kengeri, 3 Nelamangala, 4 Thyamagondlu and 5 Magadi. I enclose another Statement showing the ~~[illegible]~~ of the Mohatarfa

allowances were fixed. The Superintendent of Survey is unable to say whether or not these amounts are included in the Municipal share, but considering the difference I am inclined to think that they were exclusive of such share. I therefore solicit orders whether the Village Officials may be paid an allowance on the Municipal share in the above villages.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Wlang Meason
Fr Dy Commissioner.

WMB

Statement showing the amount of Mohtate collections taken into account in fixing by the final remuneration of village officers in the following places

No	Name	Amount in Rupees	Remarks
1	Nelamangal	591 4 6	
2	Tyamagondla	465 8 "	
3	Dodballapur	2915 " "	
4	Devanhalli	1708 6 1	
5	Vadiganahalli	1019 " 5	
6	Hoskote	" " "	
7	Sulibele	507 8 "	
8	Anekal		Not yet settled
9	Sarjapur		
10	Dommasandra		
11	Chennapatna		
12	Closepett		
13	Kankanhalli		
14	Magadi	1624 " "	
15	Yellahanka	285 2 "	
16	Kengeri	336 4 "	

Survey Supdt's Office
Bangalore 16th Jan 93

Hdq J P Grant
Supdt Revenue

Mohan J Meason

49

Statement Shewing Mohatur fa, Government and Municipal realized in each Municipality in 1891-92.

No.	Name of Municipality	Mohatur fa Government Share			Mohatur fa Municipal share			Remarks
			As	P	Rs	As		
1	Yelahanka	327	9	1	327		11	
2	Kengeri	97	5		397	5	7	
3	Nelamangala	761	3		761	3	9	
4	Huyamagondhi	727	1	0	727	1	0	
5	Magady	1157		3	1157	8	3	

Dy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
Dated 4th March 1892.

[illegible]
For Dy Commissioner

[illegible]

21(a)

Letter from the Dy Com of the Hassan District dated 1st March 1893 No 852 requesting, ~~that~~ with reference Govt Proceedings dated 31 October 1892 No $\frac{5954.63}{LF\ 157\ 92}$ same to the continuance of the mutseddy on Rs 12 now ~~maintained~~ employed by in the Municy of Hassan ~~for~~ on collection duty

R
L1900

No $\frac{15920}{LF.157-92}$

924/27/3/93

~~From the Same~~

1222 9 20.6.93 L3023

Order thereon

The Dy Com agn report is requested with reference to the foll observations.

(a) The Dy Com does not state wh Mohateerfa collecte Hassan Town reckoned as reven the Shanbhoge a notice has been

should be carefully ascertained) and reported

(b) Who now writes up the Bhaneshumare accounts, which form the basis of the Mohatewfa Jamabandi, should be kept

(c) The 5 per cent alluded in Para 15 of the printed proceedings dated 31st October 2 No $\frac{5954-63}{LF\ 157-92}$ apparently all charges on account of collection, whereas Dy Coms has compared just it only the payment mutaseddy, omitting the of Peons &c employed work.

Chief Secy

oms, Hassan Dass

Secy's orders]

Recd. Letter from the Dy Comr of
21/7/92 the Bangalore District dated 3rd
12 March 1893 No 875, submitting 2
statements - one shewing the total
amount of Mohatarfa collection
and the other the ~~amount~~ portion thereof
taken into account in fixing the
Potigee remuneration and requesting
orders as to whether the village
officials may be paid an allowance
on the municipal share of Mohatarfa,
which appears to have been excluded
in fixing the Potigee

R L2445

19177-

L F 157-92 8/17/5/93
18
From Dl Bangalore
755 9 9-1-94 L 2050

Order thereon

	Mohatarfa									Amount of Mohatarfa taken into account in fixing Potige		
	Govt Share			Municipal share			Total					
Yelahanka	327	9	11	327	9	11	655	3	10	√285	2	"
Kengeri	397	5	7	397	5	7	794	11	2	√336	4	"
Nelamangala	761	3	9	761	3	9	1522	7	6	√591	4	6
Thyamagondi	727	1	"	727	1	"	1454	2	"	√465	8	"
Magady	1157	8	3	1157	8	3	2315	"	6	1624	"	"

From the figures entered
in the above statements, of which
an abstract is given in the margin,
it would appear that the Mohatarfa
taken into account in fixing the
Potigee remuneration is less than
the share thereof credited to Govt
in the municipalities of Yelahanka
Kengeri, Nelamangala & Thyamagondi
but it is considerably more
the ~~Govt share of Mohatarfa~~ same in
the case of the remaining municipality
of Magady, but the Dy Comr
recommends the payment of
remuneration to village officials

53

municipal share of the Mohatarfa in all the municipalities referred to. Government ~~are aware~~ have no doubt that the extended operation of the Mohatarfa on exempted classes authorized in the late Chief Comr's Proceedings dated 7 September 1879 c/o 3362-73 / ml 161 developed the income from this source and that the whole Mohatarfa was ~~ought to have been~~ taken into account in fixing the Potigee and not ~~on~~ Govt share only as the Dy Comr seems to consider. Owing to the increase of work devolving on the village officials in collecting this duty, the Govt will not however object to the payment of extra remuneration, but the principle upon which the payment is recommended does not commend itself to Govt. If at all it ought to be paid on the difference between the total Mohatarfa minus the amount taken into account in fixing the Potigee and not upon the municipal share. Before passing final orders however, the Dy Comr is requested to submit a statement shewing the no and value of houses paying Mohatarfa as existing previous to 1879 ~~and~~ when all houses were ordered to be taxed, without allowing any exemptions and as they now stand in view to ascertain the number houses newly brought under taxation accordance with the orders of 1879 and the tax collected thereon.

For Chief

the Dy Comr Bangalore Dist

and the increase in the number & value of houses, and trade ~~shops &c~~

~~and not only a portion thereof~~

issue JP
12/5

84 15109

(General Serial No. 30.)

Mind 189 L3023

21 From The Deputy Commissioner

13 Hassan District

To L3029

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 20th June 1893.

Despatched 21st do —

Received 23

Enclosures No

General No. 1222

No. 5

In reply to Govt Progs No 15920/157.92 dated 24-3-93

SUBJECT

stating that the Municipal Board have in their proceedings dated 3rd Inst resolved upon getting the post of Mohatarfa Mutsuddy abolished altogether and to entrust the Mohatarfa Collection to the Kasaba Shanbogue . . .

L B Mill
[illegible]

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

To the Same &c No 360-1/L+157-92 8/11/7/93

No 1222/S

Deputy Commissioner's office

Hassan district.

Dated: Hassan 20th June 1893

From

P. N. Purnanja Esquire

Deputy Commissioner

Hassan district.

To

The Chief secretary

to Government of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No 15920/157.92 dated 24th March 1893, requesting certain details in connection with the appointment of Mohaturfa Mutsuddy of the Hassan Town, I have the honor to state for the information Government, that the Municipal Board have, in their Proceedings dated 3rd Instant resolved, to ab-

the post altogether and to give
effect to the orders of Government
for entrusting this work to the
Kasaba shambogue of Hassan Town

I have the honor to be

Sir

your most obedient servant

M. Purnaiya

Deputy commissioner

Hassan district

21 Rfd 91 - 2

14 Letter from the D1 of the Hassan District dated 20 June 1893, stating with reference to Govt Proceedings dated 24 March 1893 No 15920/13157.92 that the Municipal Board of Hassan ~~in~~ resolved in their Proceedings dated 3rd June 1893, to abolish the post of Mutsuddy on Rs 12 employed on the collection of municipal taxes at Hassan.

Q L33.

360-61 / 7 157.92 D 11/7/93

From D Hassan
65 O 22.7.93 L 211

Govt approve of the Boards resolution to do away with the collection Mutsuddy's services & presume that the President has given effect to the same.

J.P.
For Chief Secretary

30/6

Order thereon

Under the circumstances now stated, the ~~appoin~~ retention of the Mutsuddy on Rs 12 per mensem employed by the Hassan Municipality on collection duty will not be sanctioned. His services may be done away with at once

J.P.
To Chief S

To The D1 Com Hassan Dist
Comptroller

LBB
15-1-94

~~Submitted~~ Please put up revision statement
[illegible] 10/3/94

The previous references are 10, 12 & 14 in this file.
submitted with a draft
19-3-94

(General Serial No 30.) 10860

1893-94 L20750

21 [illegible]
15 [illegible]

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 9th January 1894

Despatched 12

Received 16

To the Tamese
No 15-788 [illegible]

Enclosures No. 1

General No.
D No. 755

The Government Proceedings No. 19177 L.F. 157-92 dated 17th May 1893, calling for a statement shewing the number and value of houses paying Mohatarfa as existing previous to 1879 and as they stand now.

Begs to submit a statement as called for in the above

For Dy Commissioner

58 Ane 6 Wst: M

Statement shewing number and value of houses paying Mohatarfa as existing previous to 1879 and as they now stand in the Minor Municipalities of the Bangalore District.

No	Municipalities	Mohtarfa Amount taken into account in fixing Sukka Potgi	As existing previous to 1879				As they now stand.				Remarks
			No of houses	Value of houses i.e. assessment.			No of houses	Value i.e. assessment			Increase Excess [illegible]
1	Kengeri	336.	253	358	1	-	291	407	"	"	48-15-0
2	Yelahanka	285	291	223	2	"	449	583	"	"	35[illegible]-14-[illegible]
3	Magadi	1624	232	564	"	"	1033	1160	4	"	59[illegible]-4[illegible]
4	Hoskote	— " —	1208	463	"	"	734	562	8	"	99 8-
5	Sulibele	507-8	78	195	"	"	352	327	8	"	132-8
6	Nelamangala	591	637	885	10	"	798	709	12	"	[illegible]
7	Tyamagondla	465	560	476	8	"	895	658	2	"	181-[illegible]
8	Closepet		342	748	"	"	1173	1295	12	"	547-[illegible]
9	Chennapatam		546	1231	"	"	1542	2038	10	"	807-1[illegible]
10	Anekal		456	1011	6	4	1367	1739	8	"	728
11	Sarjapur		183	285	8	"	626	583	"	"	[illegible]
12	Dommasandra		83	138	8	"	418	365	"	"	226-8
13	Devanhalli	1708	1181	1006	12	"	1212	1279	12	"	273-[illegible]
14	Vadigenahalli	1019	656	588	8	"	696	691	8	"	10[illegible]-[illegible]
15	Doddaballapur	2915	396	503	"	"	1464	1100	12	"	[illegible]
16	Kankanhalli		566	280	10	"	726	594	"	"	[illegible]

Dy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
11th January 1894

[illegible]
for Dy Commissioner

Pro of the Govt. of Mysore

Read:- Bangalore Dy Commrs
Dl ~~letter No. 878 of 35~~ No ~~1014~~ 755 of ~~2~~
9 Jany/94 ~~March/94~~ in reply to Govt. Pro. of
17 May/93 No 19177
L7 157-92
Read again the Bangalore Dy
Commrs letter of 3 March/93
No 875.

R L2579

15785-6
L7 157-92 of 22/3/94

Order thereon With reference to
para 14 of Govt. Pro. of 31 Octr/92
No 5954-63 the Deputy Commr.
L7 157-92 submits the question
of Bangalore of an allowance being sanctioned
from ~~the~~ municipal funds to
the Village officials for their
collecting the portion of Mohatarfa taxes
made over to the ~~municipalities~~
of Minor municipalities of
the District. The question is
whether the Mohatarfa revenue
taken into account by the
Survey Deptt in fixing the
~~Pot~~ Lakka Potgi of the Village
Officials of the towns noted in
the margin does ~~include~~
~~or not~~ or does not include
the ~~portion~~ moneys of Mohatarfa
made over. The Tal.

⊕ 1 Nelamangala
2 Tyamagondla
3 Dodballapur
4 Devenahally
5 Vadegarahally
6 Lubbele
7 Magadi
8 Yelahanka
9 Kangeri to the municipalities

authorities ~~must have~~ who furnished the figures ~~on which of reven~~ of the details of revenue on which the Potgi was fixed must be able to find out the necessary information by obtaining the ~~necessary~~ reference from the Survey Dept. ~~whether~~ as to when the figures were furnished.

The Dy Comr is requested to ascertain when the Potage settlement was made, & ~~ascertain~~ state the details of the figures on which the amount of the Potage allowance was based.

~~If~~ It is not clear ~~of the~~ whether the amounts mentioned in the Statement received with the Dy Comm's Docket of 9th Jany last are the total Mohatarfa revenue or only the moiety of it made over to the Municipalities. ~~If the former~~ This must be explained. the ~~figures~~ amounts taken together of the two moieties given in the Statement received with the letter of 9th Jany/94. for the five towns therein mentioned are ~~cons~~ very much in excess of those mentioned in the subsequent statement of 9th Jany and requires explanation

If in fixing the the total Mohatarfa revenue which ~~was~~ then existed was taken into account no additional allowance can now be sanctioned. ~~and the question~~

If only the Govt. Moiety was taken into account, the Village Officials ~~must~~ have not been benefited by a lesser Jodi ~~having been~~ charged on their service Inams lands than would have been the case if the whole Mohatmfa had been taken & into account ~~with the consequence of deducting the charging the proportionately increased Potgi to the Jari amount of the Inams.~~

A it has to be seen whether

This purpose, the ~~Mf~~ Dy Commr. ~~will be~~ is requested to ~~study the question in all its details and~~ submit ~~a comprehensive report together with~~ extracts from the Pakka Potgi Registers showing ~~what~~ the Potgi ~~the Officials in question get and~~ amounts & ~~what~~ the Inam lands ~~they had~~ ~~& what Jodi was charged upon them~~

Sheerbhogs had & the Jodi paid thereon before & after the Potgi settlement

In the case of the Sex towns for which Potgi

has not yet been ~~[illegible]~~ settled, the Dy Comm^r will ~~[illegible]~~ ascertain from the Survey Dept^t whether the Municipal portion of the Maheshwar will be excluded in fixing the Govt. Potgi and what inams or cash payments the officials are now enjoying.

the Dy Comm^r is requested to ascertain the extent of Inam. & other remuneration enjoyed by the ~~[illegible]~~ village officials ~~[illegible]~~ concerned ~~[illegible]~~, & if he is satisfied that the present remuneration is ~~[illegible]~~ not adequate for their services to grant a percentage remission not exceeding 2 per cent till the Potage settl^t is effected.

N 19-3-94

[signature] 19/3/94 For Chief Sec

To. The Dy Com Bangalore
" Supt. Rev. Survey

(General Serial No. 01) 450

1894. L 77

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldurg Taluk

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan Commissioner
of Mysore.

Dated 11th July 1894

Despatched 11th

Received

Enclosures No. One

General No. 31
No. 31

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Recommending a remission of 1 per Cent Cess in the Balance Employed in Municipal Collections in Taluk for Towns

Submitted Ord

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

13-7-94

No 36/31, Enclose

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

To ~~the~~ The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Dated 11th July 1894.

Despatched

Sir,

In Submitting a copy of a Resolution recorded by the Municipal Commissioners of the Town of Harihar at a meeting held on 12.2.1894, I have the honor to state that the Potige, which under para 14 of the Proceedings of Government No 5954-63 / L.A. 157-92 dated 1st October 1892 disentitles the village Establishments ~~from claiming~~ to claim commission, does not benefit the Talaries in any way, the only person

who get the advantage thereof being the Patel and Shanbhogue. For making Mohatarfa collections in Municipal towns, the services of Talaries are as indispensable as those of Patels and Shanbhogues. But unlike Talaries in villages, Talaries in Municipal towns get no "aya" for their services and it does not seem fair to compel them to work without remuneration.

2. Under these circumstances I am of opinion that a small commision may be paid to the Talaries assisting in making Municipal collections, both in the town of Harihar and in other Municipal towns. The rate recommended by the Harihar Board seems too high, amounting as it does to above two per cent of the collections. Under the Proceedings quoted above, two per cent represents the commision payable to the entire village establishment.

establishment engaged in the work of collection. For their share of such work, Patels and Shanbhogues get a Potiga allowance. For the Talaries, share of work, a commission not exceeding one per cent would be a reasonable remuneration and I beg to solicit the sanction of Government to the payment thereof in all Municipal towns in this District including Harihar.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

C. Kellinghusen

Deputy Commissioner

Chitaldroog District

66. Enclosure

Extract from the Proceedings of the Harihar municipality dated 12th February, 1894

× × ×

× × ×

× × ×

IV [illegible]

[illegible]

Extract

[illegible signature]

Deputy Commissioner

11/7/1953

Chitaldroog

Read letter of 11 July 1894 No 36/31 from the Deputy Commr of Chitaldroog District re-
18 commending the payment of a commission not exceeding one per cent to Talaries in the Municipal towns of the Dist., for assisting in the collection of House and Mohatarfa taxes.

Order thereon.

R L 226

1519
L 7-157-92 & 26/7/94

Before passing orders on the proposals now sent the Govt deem the Dy Commr to submit information on the following points:—

I. Before the formation of the Harihar Municy if the Talaries were employed in the collection of the Mohatarfa how every they remunerated

~~The proposal submitted is a novel one and requires further information. before the Deputy Commr will be requested to report on the following points:~~

II. ~~Is there any order laying down that~~ Why the establishment of a Municipality in any

town were ~~relieving~~ the townspeople relieved from their duty of paying Aya to Talaries as hereto in respect of the collection of Mohatmfa revenue? It is believed that Talaries get Aya from the townspeople in respect of land revenue.

III How many Talaries are proposed to be employed in each of the Municipal towns of the District? What remuneration would each individual get at the rate or rates ~~which~~ not exceeding one per cent ~~of~~ on the revenue from Mohatmfa and Housetax? ~~and at to~~ whether the amounts so calculated would be sufficient? and what Aya and at what rates, whether in grain or cash, ~~the Talaries to and how~~ the Talaries ~~were getting~~ would have been entitled to if the Municipalities had not been established?

N

Issue 24-7-94

att 24/7/94

To, the Dy. Commissioner Chit[illegible] of

Octn Branch
- Please put up
[illegible]
[illegible]
7/4/96.

References put up
[illegible]
2/4/96

Gnbd to Secretary

The [illegible] having [illegible] purely municipal [illegible] which is [illegible] year by year in greater proportion than in villages the grounds which once existed for entrusting its collection to the hereditary Govt agency have now practically ceased & the resuscitation of the system proposed by the Dy Comr is inadmissable. On the contrary the hereditary agency will gradually have to be displaced by special municipal agency. No hard & fast rules are necessary but each case of a municipal shanbhog may be decided on its merits as it comes up.

[illegible]
19/5/96

L 2862

8155

1895-96

From The Dy Commissioner.

To Bangalore District

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Genl & Rev Departments.

Dated 30th March 1896

Despatched 31st Do

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

D No. 956.

In reply to Govt Pro. No. 15785-6 (SE 32) d/22nd March 1894
L.F. 157-92

Suggesting that the Survey Department may be instructed to settle once for all the Potagi on all items of Revenue in the Minor Municipalities.

References to the marked.

[illegible] 31/7
General Records
Please put up. Pro. 1/8/92 No 3977/L483 Dy 1.6.92
quoted within
[illegible]
31/5/92

The above Pro. with connected papers was sent to the Pet. Repte on 7th June 1892 after General No 2434/P25 of 30th May/92 from Dy Comr Tum [illegible] No 1210 of 28/5/92
[illegible]

M. G. C. P.—31-1-94.—3000.

D. No. 956.

By Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore District,
Dated 30th March 1896

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Rev & Genl Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to the Government Proceedings No. 15785-6 L.F. 157-92 dated 22nd March 1894, anent the payment of an allowance from Municipal Funds to the village Officials for collecting the Mohatarfa made over to the Minor Municipalities till the Potage settlement is effected, I have the honor to submit that the Pakka Potage of Anekal, Sarjapur and Dommasandra towns has since been settled by the Survey Department, but the Mohatarfa revenue has been excluded from the revenue on which the Potage is calculated. On a reference to the Survey Superintendent, he refers to Government Proceedings No. 3977 L. 485

dated 1st June 1892, according to which the abolition of Mohatorpa in all the Municipalities is under the consideration of Government, and even if it should continue, it must be collected at the expense of the Municipalities. This order apparently seems to have been cancelled by the spirit of the Government Proceedings of March 1894 quoted above. It seems desirable that the Potage on Mohatorpa should also be settled by the Survey Department at the same time as the Land Revenue, as separate settlements can only result in confusion and clash of interests.

2. The abolition of Mohatorpa does not appear to be included in the programme for the revision of the Municipal Regulations, and although the item is made over entirely to the Municipalities, the collection and recording thereof are identical with those of Land Revenue proper.

3. I have accordingly the honor

To suggest that the [illegible] Department be instructed to supply [illegible] for all the [illegible] in all items of revenue in the Minor Municipalities.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

[illegible]
[illegible]

548
S.F. 157-92 9/11/7/96

Mun. Offl. Memo.

The Superintendent, ~~Mysore~~ 20 Revenue Survey in Mysore, is requested to forward to this office a statement in the marginally noted form showing the amount of Mohatarfa ~~taken into account~~ collected in each Municipality and the proportion, if any, of the Potagi allowance payable to village servants on account of Mohatarfa collections.

Name of Municipality	Mohatarfa	Whether Mohatarfa is taken into account in fixing Potagi allowance or not	If taken into account what proportion & amount of the Potagi is payable on account of Mohatarfa collection	The percentage of such payment to the total Mohatarfa collection	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6

"By Order"

Secretary

Draft

To The Superintendent,
Mysore Rev: Survey

9/7/96

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

1896 1627 L 34

LBB
18/8/96

Put up File No 157 of 92 Dig 26/8

Sir, The above was given to you for reg: & the same was not returned to records.

Dig 26/8/96.

The file was submitted to Secy with L No 3308 from Bangalore DC No 1173 of 3/6/96 and was received back with his orders thereon on 11/8/96 Please enquire if it was sent to Revenue & Petn Branch Dig 1/9/96

Petn Br

is required for the Secy.

Dig 1/9/96

The file was not received in the Branch

X. Remainder destroyed

Dig 2/9/96.

Please

Enquire

2/9

File put up

G.P. No 3095 To DC Mysore of 21-9-96

From

The Supt Mysore Revenue Survey

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

Dated

Despatched 17th

Received August 1896

General No. 140
No.

Enclosure No.

Secretary's No 548
L Fl 157-92

dated 11th July 1896 and remainder

No 2239
L Fl No 157-92

dated 14th August 1896

Subd by Sir Cr.

This is a matter which must necessarily take a long time to settle - In the meantime, considering the size & importance of the Seringapatam Municipality & the fact that its Mohalarfu collections, which are considerable, were not taken into account in fixing the Potige, I submit

In reply has the honor to state that it has been

been found necessary to make reference to each District in order to collect necessary information as to the Mohalarfa collected in each — Municipality and that the — compilation of the information required will take some considerable time yet.

Supt. Mysore Revenue Survey

The file is incomplete